RESTORATION REVIEW

Paul Blanshard gives a "balance sheet" on outcome of Vatican II.

See review of his new book on page 62.

Volume 9, No. 4 **April, 1967**

Volume 9, No. 4 **Leroy Garrett, Editor** **April 1967**

PAUL BLANSHARD AT VATICAN II: A REVIEW

It is like two trains on separate, parallel tracks that are moving in the same direction. The passenger in Train A, which is moving slightly faster than Train B, looks out of the window casually and thinks that his train is moving very slowly past Train B, which seems to him to be standing still. The truth is that both trains are moving rapidly, but the passengers in each train tend to judge their motion by that of the other.

By this analogy Mr. Blanshard gives his view of the accomplishments of Vatican II and of the recent changes in the Roman Catholic Church. In terms of its own long history, the Roman Church moved rapidly and accomplished much during Vatican II. But in terms of Western culture, which has advanced more in the past two centuries than the entire world had progressed up to that time, both the Council and the Church have moved so slowly that its progress is imperceptible.

The Council moved the Roman Catholic Church from the thirteenth to the seventeenth century, which is high velocity indeed. But it still left Christendom's largest church 300 years behind the times. Progress? Speed? It all depends on which train you are riding!

In an effort to draw up a "Balance Sheet" of credits and debits of Vatican II, Mr. Blanshard lists these four on the credit side:

1. *Liturgy reform.* The shift from "the gobbledegook of Latin ritual" to the language of the communicants, even if only partially realized, is viewed as a move away from obscurantism. Some priests in some rituals can now face their congregations instead of turning their backs.

2. Admission of possible mistakes in the past. Blanshard is encouraged that Pope John and Pope Paul both admitted that the Church may have erred in some of its activities in the distant past, and he sees this as "a great emotional gain for honesty in Christian interrelationships." While these admissions were vague and general, he does not doubt their genuineness, and he is made hopeful that in another century some pope will go further and actually concede that his Church has been doctrinally mistaken.

3. Limited religions liberty, in principle. Blanshard sees this as perhaps the greatest single advance in principle of all the sessions. While there is much yet to be desired in the Church's view of religious liberty for others, it has at least taken the first step in at least giving lip service to the principle.

4. The commitment to social reform. The Roman Catholic leaders have been much too long in either heaven or purgatory, Blanshard observes, and have consequently ignored the world that really matters to their constituents. Now they are more concerned with human suffering and social reform. What came out of Vatican II may have to be viewed as only a freshman textbook in Catholic social science, which Blanshard deems appropriate since the Church is not yet ready for a graduate textbook.

He finds four points for the debit side also:

1. *Continued opposition to birth control.* Blanshard is convinced that Pope Paul hurt himself badly with his Church and with the world by clinging to the traditional opposition to contraceptives. Overpopulation is an evil that is the parent of many other evils, and sooner or later the Church is going to have to yield on this, point. But the Pope had his chance at Vatican II, and since he didn't take it his influence is irreparably damaged. It was the greatest single defeat for intelligence at the Council sessions, Blanshard insists.

2. *The reassertion of Catholic claims on the public treasury.* The Roman clergy is unrelenting in laying claims upon public funds for the support of its schools. Vatican II did not change this, making the Church's policy just as antagonistic to the American principle of separation of church and state as ever.

3. *The continuation of papal autocracy.* The Council depicted papal absolutism as much as it depicted progress, for along with such gains mentioned above, which at least faintly suggest a move toward more freedom, both popes felt free to break into the proceedings with arbitrary decisions that were contrary to Council opinion. At Vatican II the pope was not merely the superior cleric, for he was an awesome figure that would be worshipped before he would be questioned.

4. *Discrimination in mixed marriages.* After four years of behind-the-scenes debates only two minor changes were made on the policy on mixed marriages, and these "only add insult to injury" and are wholly unsatisfactory. Blanshard will not be satisfied on this score until the Church allows parents to make their own decisions about the religion of their children, without any priestly interference.

While the foregoing appears to us to be the heart of the book, there is indeed much more, all of which reveals careful research on Mr. Blanshard's part. We are impressed both with his resourcefulness and his sophistication. He is obviously a concerned man, one moved by principle rather than bigotry. As one reads this book he is convinced that the Roman Church would itself profit greatly by listening to this reasonable and responsible criticism. One would also suppose that Pope Paul would be eager to read the chapters

about himself and Pope John, and that it ought to influence his thinking. “Here is an appeal to reason and to human dignity” one says to himself as he reads these chapters.

Yet the book is quite candid. It is explained to those who have the image of affable Pope John as one who was ready to make concessions in order to achieve unity with the Protestants that such a view is incorrect, for the only kind of unity the kindly pope ever advocated, even in his most liberal moments, was for the dissenters to return to Rome. Pope Paul is described as an institutional man, so institutional in fact that Blanshard questions that he can be considered a truly educated man. Reversing Emerson’s remark that an institution is the lengthened shadow of a man, Blanshard says that Paul is the lengthened shadow of an institution.

There is a provocative and embarrassing chapter on the Jews, which shows how the Roman clergy in Germany played ball with Hitler, actually justifying moderate anti-Semitism and objecting only to extreme and immoral acts. He reveals how the German bishops continued to receive money from Hitler, almost to the very end of his regime. The Hitler-Vatican Concordat was never renounced by any pope, not even during Hitler’s brutalities against the Jews, and the Church continued receiving benefits from Hitler. He discusses at length the influence of the play *The Deputy*, which exposed the Church’s duplicity in reference to the Nazis, and he freely refers to Lewy’s documented account of the conduct of the German bishops during the Hitler period in a book entitled *The Catholic Church and Nazi Germany.*

There are chapters on Christian Unity, which reveals the Church’s *internal* factions as well as discusses the larger problem of ecumenicity; and Sex, Celibacy and Women, which raises haunting questions about the Church’s view of sex, convent life and the treatment of women. And there is extensive treatment of Blanshard’s favorite subjects: birth control, federal aid to parochial schools, and what he calls “the miraculous underworld,” where even relics and indulgences are treated with the same scholarly objectivity that characterizes all the chapters.

The book goes beyond Vatican II, of course, and deals with the issues within the larger framework of world culture and Roman Catholic history. Like other Blanshard books, it is a treatment of modern Roman Catholic thought and practice as a cultural problem. This should be welcomed by all people, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant or no religion at all. Even if one suspects that Mr. Blanshard goes out of his way in his treatment of Vatican II to *expose* the Roman Catholic Church, this should be offset by the fact that he is indeed dealing with problems of great significance to human welfare and with an institution that is closely involved with these problems. We should therefore be grateful for all the information we can get. And above all else it can be said of this volume that it is surely informative, *disturbingly* informative. It appears to us that it should be more generally reviewed and discussed in the world press.

Our readers may order *Paul Blanshard at Vatican* II from our office for $5.95.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

LESSONS IN ANATOMY

A book recently published in England has been described by some British reviewers as *frightening.* It is Anthony Sampson's *Anatomy of Britain.* One writer, while commenting upon the claim made in the book *Honest to God* that man has become "mature" and no longer needs the orthodox concepts of God, points out that anybody who has bought the idea of man's maturity ought to read *Anatomy of Britain.*

Sampson, who is conceded to be an able and cultured journalist, takes a hard look at the forces controlling British life, all the way from the courts and parliament to big business and the universities, as well as TV and radio. "It is a terrifying picture of uncoordinated drift," says one commentator on the book. Those who have the most power in British life seem frustrated and thwarted by others. It is a nation of people who are rapidly losing their autonomy, for everyone seems adrift upon currents outside his control.

The nation seems to be moving aimlessly, with no clearly defined goals. As one cabinet member was quoted as saying: "The trouble is we don't believe in *anything;* we don't believe in Communism, or in anti-Communism, or in free enterprise.

The author himself describes his research as "a baffling journey." He finds his country confused concerning its values and uncertain concerning what it is supposed to believe. It proved to be a disturbing lesson in anatomy, both to its author and to its readers.

Such a journey into anatomy might be helpful to those of us on this side of the Atlantic. What would a book on *Anatomy of America* have to say? Have we reached that maturity that Bishop Robinson speaks of, which makes the old ideas of a God in heaven irrelevant. Indeed, has man "come of age" in America? This might be questioned since we lead the world in crime, alcoholism, broken homes, juvenile delinquency, and mental illness. Our foreign policy has been so inconsistent that many nations of the world doubt our sincerity, and we are engaged in a terrible war abroad that has involved us in internal disputes at home. And for the first time in the history of the world a nation has a serious problem with the mental illness of its children, and that dubious honor is ours.

Surely the seeds of decay are present in American culture. When Toynbee listed the causes for the fall of the great nations of history, he included the decline of agrarian life, militarism, heavy taxation by centralized power, breakdown of home life, decline in morality, sexual looseness and perversion even in high places, and increasing loss of individual autonomy.

It is a tragic truth that most of these or all of these have long been characteristic of our society. Despite civilian control of the military, our budget and foreign policy betray us as a militaristic nation, or one that is certainly moving in that direction. There can be no question about the decline of agricultural life in these days of mechanized farming. As a teacher in both high school and college I am made increasingly aware of the disappearance of the farm girl. Future generations of Americans will not be talking about the things that happened "back on the farm," and that tragic fact may effect our values as well as our poetry, novels and plays.

When Toynbee referred to taxes as a sign of decay, he was speaking of only 25%. That is, whenever a nation taxes its people one-fourth of what they make, that nation begins to decay. We have already passed the 25% mark, if one considers the whole range of our tax system.

Books like *The Lonely Crowd* and *The Organization Man* point out the extent to which we have departed from that "rugged individualism" that made our nation great. There is an "other directedness" that seems to motivate us more than our inward forces. Our nation's smoking habit well illustrates our tendency to conform to those around us. Even now that it is an established fact that smoking is hazardous to one's health, the practice goes on unabated, yea even increasing among our youth. If Emmanuel Kant was right in insisting that one's action cannot be moral unless it is autonomous, then our inclination to become carbon copies of each other is a moral hazard. Our way of life seems to make us less sensitive to the sense of oughtness within.

Our people's preoccupation with sex is so evident that we can hardly quarrel with Billy Graham when he says that America is on the greatest sex binge of any nation in all history.

This can be seen in many small ways, even in little humorous episodes. While reading a stamp news magazine the other day, I noticed one ad that was headed with that one word of all words in caps — SEX. The advertiser went on to tell about his product, which had nothing at all to do with sex, despite Freud's contention that *everything* does, but I suppose he figured that was *the* way to turn all eyes to his ad. It reminds me of the English prof at a college where I once taught. Whenever attention lagged in his classes, whether amidst Chaucer or the split infinitive, he would startle his class by sounding forth with SEX!, which always restored attention, even if it were Chaucer.

What is vital to me just now is not an anatomical view of Britain or America, however important that is, but of the church, which is the only thing, with Christ as its Head, that can save the world from its collision course. Let's have the courage to enter into a study in depth on *the anatomy of the church*, with the same kind of honesty and precision that were present in Sampson's study of Britain.

It will call for the asking of the same kind of questions that Sampson asked about his country. Do we as Christians *really* believe anything? Is Christ a reality in our lives? What do we love? Have we a sense of destiny? Have we any real concern for suffering humanity?

A series of seminars on the anatomy of the church could begin with two important descriptions of the church. One pictures the church as "the habitation of God," while the other speaks of it as "the pillar and ground of the truth." These are tremendous concepts that surely relate to every area of human concern. What is *the truth*, and how does it relate to all the sciences and humanities? In just what way does the druggist, the geophysicist, and the architect as members of Christ depict the church as the pillar and ground of truth. And what does the habitation of God mean in terms of the marriage counselor that is trying to mend a broken home or the psychiatrist who is trying to mend a broken heart.

Such a lesson in anatomy will, of course, call for critical self-examination. It might become a terrifying experience, as was that book about Britain. And as is often true in studies of . anatomy it may call for some cutting.

But we will be the healthier because of it. And we will save the world.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

TONGUE-SPEAKING IN CHURCHES OF CHRIST

By Robert Meyers

A new crisis is upon the Churches of Christ. The experience of speaking in tongues (glossolalia) is being claimed by an ever-growing number of men and women in local congregations and on the campuses of Church of Christ colleges. These persons are voluble and enthusiastic about what has happened to them. They are being met, predictably, by attitudes which threaten to turn the conflict of opinions into a debacle.

Some readers may not yet appreciate the dimensions of this movement. There are outbreaks of tongue-speaking on the campuses of at least five of the major Church of Christ colleges. The participants include, in some cases, staff personnel and an occasional faculty member. Large churches in Houston and Fort Worth have been visited by the phenomenon and have reacted differently. In one instance, the claimants were immediately booted from fellowship. In another, a much wiser group of elders followed Gamaliel's advice:

"And so now: keep clear of these men, I tell you; leave them alone. For if this idea of theirs or its execution is of human origin, it will collapse; but if it is from God, you will never be able to put them down, and you risk finding yourself at war with God." (Acts 5:38-39, NEB).

What some congregations and colleges of the Churches of Christ now risk is an action in direct defiance of the unequivocal words of Scripture:

Do not forbid ecstatic utterance (I Cor. 14:39). In an all-too-typical failure to read carefully the instruction given in I Corinthians 14 for dealing with tongue-speaking, the Churches of Christ are now putting themselves into the unbelievably absurd position of attempting to quench the Holy Spirit Himself.

A large Church of Christ in Tulsa is even now puzzling anxiously over what to do with a sizeable number of its members who are meeting in homes, experiencing a tongue-speaking gift, and telling others of the joys it brings them. Almost within the days I have been working on this article I have learned of four Church of Christ ministers who claim the gift of tongues. Every sign now visible on the horizon indicates that the movement has not reached its peak within our immediate brotherhood. It is, therefore, imperative that thoughtful and concerned leaders in the Churches of Christ arrive at a Scriptural and compassionate way of dealing with those who claim the experience.

Within the past few weeks, a well-known Church of Christ college campus has been shaken to its foundations by disagreement over how the Holy Spirit may indwell Christians and influence their lives. Before the dissension and heartache had run their course, two popular faculty members had been forced to resign, effective at once, and a third had voluntarily resigned, effective at the end of the present term.

Two of the men who are leaving had been members of the faculty for nine years. One was at the end of his second year. All three were unusually effective teachers, popular with students, and assigned to areas which brought them into especially close relationships with students.

One man claimed the baptism of the Holy Spirit in fuller measure than he had ever known, including the gift of speaking in tongues. Another claimed that the baptism brought him a more joyous assurance of the fatherhood of God than he had known before, but no experience with tongues. The third faculty member had had no personal experience with either gift as described above, but resigned because, as he put it, he believed in the power of God and thought it ought not be limited by creedal restrictions.

The college administrators, fearing growing pressures from their constituency, tried patiently and earnestly to find a way out of their dilemma. It was the belief of the dismissed faculty members that their president, had he been only a private person, would have sympathized sufficiently with their experience to have kept them on. But as the representative of a constituency with little tolerance for differences of opinion, he was

forced to order them to be still or to leave. He was all set to begin a fund-raising drive, and it did not require much imagination to guess what would happen to it if he failed to respond to pressures from parents and friends of the college.

Many who read this article can guess how the administration proceeded. The action is classic; every man who has ever had a serious difference with a Church of Christ college administration will know it by heart. First the touching effort to be a loyal friend, then the growing fear as the threats come in from the constituency, and finally the ultimatum: keep quiet or get out. The individual is sacrificed to the institution; party loyalty once again takes its customary precedence over personal loyalty and the urgings, even, of private Christian conscience.

The two faculty men now separated from their students spent an afternoon with me recently. They invited one of the college's board members to sit in and listen. We talked for many hours, discussing derails of the incident and whether it should be revealed publicly. It will perhaps surprise no one that the board member felt the story should not be told; the "let's-sweep-it-under-the-rug-lest-it-harm-the-Lord's-church" philosophy has ruled us in such cases for years. It seldom occurs to those who invoke the philosophy that the Lord's church is far bigger than any institution and is not harmed by candor.

The afternoon of talk was one of the most fascinating I have ever spent. Here were two men, both of whom I had known in years past, now claiming an experience which I have never had and do not expect to have. Yet these men talked with quiet intelligence, describing their experiences as calmly as if they had been reporting the redecorating of their houses. They analyzed with a deliberative calmness which forbad me to suppose them unstable or unbalanced. They made it crystal clear that they have suffered their dismissal without rancor or vindictiveness. They find it possible to love the men who said to them, in effect, "You must now leave your years of investment in this school, leave the friends you have made in this community, and leave the students you have come to love—and you must do it because you refuse to pretend that nothing has happened to you."

After the president of the college wrote formally to describe the two men's experience as part of a "movement" which put them in conflict with the "basic beliefs of the brotherhood as a whole," one of the men wrote a reply. His remarks deserve a wide reading:

"Dear Dr. …,

> "My response to the letter from the administration has been to evaluate my responsibility. My first responsibility must always be to God. I must try to live honestly before Him, freely enquiring within the Restoration tradition of Biblical faith and individual responsibility. I must question creeds, written or unwritten, and traditions, in order to engage honestly in a lifelong dialogue with the Word of God.

"My vocation as a teacher demands a secondary responsibility to engage in an other dialogue, one held with my students, in which the validity, relevancy, and, I hope, truth of our subject matter is tested. In this dialogue there is no proper place for crusading, for propagandizing, or for cultivating allegiance to personalities. Allegiance in this dialogue must be to the truth.

"As a Christian teacher, my third responsibility is to what we would call the brotherhood. When I maintain my integrity in my dialogue with God and with my students, I am then serving the brotherhood with equal integrity. The college, leading rather than following the brotherhood in the restoration of New Testament Christianity, should maintain each faculty member's duty to reexamine constantly his beliefs in the light of Scriptures.

"The question presently before us, that of the direct operation of the Holy Spirit, is not a question concerning the fundamentals of the Christian faith. While we have differences of opinion about this subject, greater differences of opinion, even on the more general questions of the providence of God and the answering of prayers, is tolerated within the brotherhood, within our own congregation, and within the college.

"This issue, however, does threaten to become divisive. Indeed, what the .... College administration now does will contribute to, or discourage, such divisiveness. We can face the problem positively, promoting unity and love, demanding respect for differing opinions, and encouraging study. On the other hand, we can react negatively, tolerating rumors, arguing personalities, fearing open discussion, distrusting that truth can and will prevail in a free dialogue.

"If I resign from the college over this question, or if I am asked to resign, we will have taken the first step toward dividing the brotherhood on the issue. Surely you want to avoid this. If the problem does result in this, however, I can only hope that we will face our differences openly and without loss of love for each other as persons. I definitely believe that if any such action is taken, our concern and respect for the students necessitates that they know the reason for my leaving. Attempting to hide these reasons from them will create bitterness and disillusionment in countless ways.

"Dr. , as Christian educators, defending principles which are increasingly challenged by secularization, let us not divide on an issue which should only tend to greater dependence on God and greater unity in Christ. Let us embrace this challenge to deepen our faith and set an example in the exercise of Christian unity."

The president of the college would be less than human if this lucid and reasonable plea did not move him. But he could not respond to it as a free man. In a harness of his own choosing, and engaged in a noble work, he drew behind him that unwieldy thing that is a college. It may be that in being true to it, he was not completely able to be true to himself. If so, we may all pity him for there is not one of us who has not wrestled with the temptation to compromise private integrity for the sake of public leadership.

When the president declared that he could not tolerate on his Christian college campus men who claimed the gift of the Spirit, the writer of the above letter asked for and received permission to address the assembled students in chapel. He spoke to them these words:

> Disagreements between brethren and coworkers can so easily lead to factionalism and bitter feelings that I feel it is my duty to you, and to this school I love so much, to encourage you to remain dispassionate about this action. Mistakes may have been made on both sides, but sincere, good people have tried to make decisions which would be best for the school in the long run. My choice has been to resign from my teaching position rather than to agree to cease all discussion with people related to ..... College about the Holy Spirit. I simply cannot conscientiously cease answering questions concerning my hope and my faith.
>
> My prayer for you is that you may meet this crisis without passion, knowing that God's will is being done. Do not let allegiance to any person make you take sides in a crusade. Avoid bitterness and dissension. May God let you grow through this exercise of love. Study the will of God through His holy word, and may the peace of Christ be with you always. You know that I love you.

During the past few weeks, both faculty members have been busy preparing to find other employment. They express no ill will toward the college, nor toward the Churches of Christ. They have no inclination to leave this fellowship, so long as they can function with integrity in it. Both are optimistic about avenues even now opening up which may keep them both active in the fellowship of their childhood church.

This account, kept impersonal to minimize emotionalism, has a single purpose: to make it clear that the Church of Christ, having failed to develop a philosophy for handling differences of opinion, is fated to pass endlessly from one unnecessary tragedy to another. We have not yet learned the lesson of Romans 14, and time is running out. Our massive troubles used to come spaced far apart, but they hit us now with disconcerting rapidity.

There was, for example, the music problem first; it split us hideously about a century ago. Many years later the great premillennial schism rent us. Then, about twenty years ago, the furor over institutionalism, split us into Herald of Truth supporters and non-Herald of Truth supporters. We have not yet made even a decent beginning toward solving this problem, but others are swarming upon us. The unity-in-diversity and community-not-

conformity pleas of Carl Ketcherside and Leroy Garrett are appealing to thousands, especially to the young men who will direct the church tomorrow, yet the reaction to these pleas has all too frequently been irrational and extreme. And now, spreading significantly for the moment at least, comes the growing army who actually claim Holy Spirit baptism instead of merely citing Scripture about it, and who claim also to speak in tongues of ecstasy and prophecy.

Tomorrow, some elders will read James 5 literally and decide they cannot reject an appeal for their services with oil and prayer. No, not tomorrow after all! Times are too swift for that; it has already happened. In two congregations of which I know, elders have declared themselves sick of scissoring the New Testament into proof-texts that fit the party image. They want all of it, they say, so they have told their flocks that if any sick man *wants* ("calls for") the elders to come and pray and anoint with oil, they will perform the service.

If one of these elders were on the board of a Church of Christ college, would he be asked to resign because his views were not in accord with the "basic beliefs of the brotherhood"? If he became a faculty member of the college and admitted his approval of this practice, would he be asked never to mention it again or else resign at once? And if so, wouldn't it be fairer to go ahead and draft a written creed now so that students and faculty of the future will know precisely what their limits are as they study the word of God?

For who knows how literally someone may read something the day after tomorrow? And what shall we do when an honest seeker comes under conviction that a verse means exactly what it says? Shall we go on telling people that they must *not* take the Bible at its word, although our preachers boast on Sunday of belonging to the only Christian fellowship that "speaks as the Bible speaks"?

Isn't it ironic that when college faculty members move, not toward liberalism or modernism, but in the direction of conservatism, they *still* get into trouble? Far from outrunning the New Testament, as has been charged of some ousted faculty of years past, these men are quite literally going back to it. Their experience with the Holy Spirit sounds astoundingly like experiences recorded of the early disciples. Their happiness, their deep assurance that they are indeed God's own sons, and their steady conviction that what they once knew in theory they now know in most glorious fact — all this is reminiscent of the state and the language of many early Christians.

But even for *this* kind of divergence they must go. Despite Paul's clear imperative, *Forbid not speaking in tongues,* they have been forbidden. Where the Bible speaks, a Church of Christ college administration has chosen to fall silent. What the Bible allows, it has chosen not to allow. What can one think, except that once again we have proved our unwritten creed more important that the written New Testament which we claim to treasure.

I have taken time to write this article because I want to plead fervently for tolerance in congregations and colleges. Let us give up the pretense that we all have the same understanding of Scripture and begin at once to fashion communities where love binds us together despite our differences. In the midst of a world-wide ecumenical movement, let us not be the last Christian folk to learn how to get along together.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

Review of "Voices of Concern" . . . No. 4

THE QUESTIONING MIND

JAMES D. BALES

We again remind the reader that we are endeavoring to deal with but a few things in our review of each chapter in *Voices of Concern.* Charles E. Warren tells us that when he was being unsettled in his religious positions, he found no one in the church who was willing, "or perhaps with the religious perspective," to help him. Some were kind, but "nearly all seemed to have some fear of me and of the situation I was in." "Jesus," he said, "showed no fear of the troubled nor any reluctance to go near those in crisis." (p. 190). First, if this was the case, it is most unfortunate. Such people need our help. Second, sometimes the attitude of the one in crisis keeps some from trying to help, or from continuing to help. Third, as far as this reviewer recalls, he had only one opportunity to help in a personal contact. He met with Charles Warren, and several others, while attending a meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society in the Chicago area.

Sinful to Question?

Warren states that he was shocked by the attitude of some who thought that the Bible should be taken at "face value without any questions or theories about underlying reasons." He thought that we should ask questions and seek (John 18:37, 8:32; Rom. 10:17, I Thess. 5:21, II Thess. 2:10-12; II Tim. 4:3-4, I John 4:1, Rev. 2:2). (c) One must have the good and honest heart (Lk. 8:15).

The Bible condemns the credulous attitude which accepts that which is in line with its prejudices; even though the evidence may sustain the position. Thus, Jesus said: "I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive." (John 5:43.) Jesus came in His Father's name. He came with the credentials from God to show that He was sent of God. The Jews rejected Him in spite of his credentials, because what He was and proclaimed was contrary to what they wanted. On the other hand, individuals who come in their own name, with only those credentials

which a man could muster, would be accepted if they told the people what they wanted to hear. This is the attitude of credulity.

Second, when one is confronted with questions and problems, he should not try to suppress these and to deny that underlying reasons. He stated that he was cut down with the statement that the secret things belong to God, but the things that are revealed belong to us. (Deut. 29:29.) He maintained that his teacher represented to him the idea that it is rebellious and sinful to ask questions, to have a curious mind, and "to seek more adequate understandings." (pp. 189-190.) We do not know whether he rightly interpreted the teacher's statement or just what the full context of the discussion was. Taking it simply as it made its impact on him, we would suggest several things. First, the Bible does not condemn the inquiring mind. In fact, the very qualities of mind which are essential to the reception of truth in any area are set forth in the Bible as the essential qualities for the reception of the Word of God. These are such as: (1) humility; which involves teachableness (Matt. 18:1-4) . (b) love for the truth; which involves willingness to hear; the refusal to be shackled by passions and prejudices; the willingness to test all things and to hold fast to that which is good he is faced with them. If he does this, he is not dealing honestly with his problems and doubts. He may continue this process of suppression until he is uneasy concerning his faith, because he has so many unanswered questions in his mind. Then he may suddenly decide to be honest and he may bring out all his problems at once. Since he has not been investigating the problems, and how to solve them, he is not prepared with any solutions. The accumulation of problems may floor him. We dealt with this briefly in 1948 in our book on *Roots of Unbelief* (pp. 55-58.).

Third, we also pointed out that one can overload the weak faith of another by dealing with his problems in the wrong way (pp. 67-68.). If an individual believes the Bible, and has good reasons for his faith, but yet finds certain things in the Bible hard to follow, he may be properly met with the statement: Believe it and act upon it because it is in the Bible. However, if the individual is having a problem which is undermining his faith in the Bible, it is not sufficient to tell him to believe it because it is in the Bible. The question of the authority of the Bible is the very question which is bothering him. Therefore, someone should help him with reasons for faith and show him that one should accept it because the Bible is authoritative. He should, of course, show the credentials of the Bible which establish its authoritative nature.

Fourth, those who believe the Bible should be willing to stop where God stopped revealing. What God has not seen fit to reveal about Himself and His Mind, man cannot penetrate into. These are the secret things of God. What God has revealed, however, we are to study, to apply, and to teach. The curiosity which is condemned is that idle curiosity which only wants to hear or tell some new or mysterious thing; but is not concerned about the bearing of truth on life. There are some who are unconcerned with what God has

revealed, and greatly concerned with what has not been revealed. They by-pass their duty and spend their time in idle speculation.

When dealing with those who have problems, we should not pounce on them as a jaybird on a June bug, but should receive them in good will and try to help them with all of the logic and information which we have. Let us solemnly recall that the way in which we treat them may cause them to stumble, or it may help save them. This is not to say that we shall be able to help everyone, but let us do our best.

Learning From Those Outside the New Testament Church

Warren was much impressed with the fact that he learned some things from those who were not members of the church, which he had not learned from members of the church. (pp. 190-191). First, being a member of the church does not mean that one has become a master of the Bible. Second, doubtless he could have learned these things from a study of the Bible itself. Third, there were members of the church who could have taught him the truths which some others taught him. Fourth, there are subjects which brethren have barely studied, but which someone else has made their life's work. We can and should learn from them. Fifth, we do not have to leave Christ's church to learn and to accept any truth which God has revealed. Learning additional truth does not make me a member of something else; it only makes me a better informed Christian. Sixth, our attitude should be that all truth belongs to us, regardless of who calls it to our attention. "Wherefore let no one glory in men. For all things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, as the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's." (1 Cor. 3:21-23). If an atheistic psychologist calls a truth to my attention, this truth is mine and I should possess it. It is not a part of his atheism, and I do not have to take any of his wrong views in order to accept any right ones which he holds.

Warren was unsettled by Darwin and by Freud. He stated that he got no help with reference to Freud, but one member of the church who was a philosophy teacher did help him with the theory of evolution. (p. 190) This reminds us that we must realize that people are in contact today with all sorts of ideas—good, bad, and indifferent. Young people, for example, are reading widely. Christians need to seriously ask themselves whether we are meeting our responsibility in writing and otherwise making available to them material which will help them with their problems. We should become acquainted with pertinent materials and try to help them. Obviously, not everyone can become acquainted with the literature in every field, but there should be some, who do, and who can direct others to meaningful material. We must get to the place where we are willing to support individuals, at least for special periods of time, so they can devote full time to writing helpful works. Especially do we need a large number of paperbacks, priced reasonably for mass distribution, which deal with many of these subjects. The author hopes, the Lord willing,

to have a part in producing more works of this kind, in some cases in cooperation with others. This was the point in the production by Dr. Robert T. Clark, a scientist, and myself of *Why Scientists Accept Evolution.* It deals with the basic bias of Darwin and others, which led them to reject the Bible and to accept evolution.—*Harding College, Searcy, Arkansas*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

REPLY To PROFESSOR BALES

CHARLES E. WARREN

In making comments on Mr. Bales' response to my essay I would like to express appreciation for the good spirit in which he writes. I'm flattered that he remembers our meeting in Chicago more years ago now than I like to remember. My remarks will be something like "painting with a broom" in that they will be too hasty and general in conclusion.

Mr. Bales gives some room for the "right to question" and does not consider this bad as such. He shows a lot of good concern that persons going through periods of unsettling questioning be helped with right attitudes and the best possible knowledge. Yet when such questions are asked as "What is the authority of the Bible?" "What is the authority of Christ?" persons of equal sincerity and ability will differ. I suspect that I found the "room to differ" more cramped in the churches of Christ than the "room to question."

The questioning mood likely reflects a concern for present personal reality more than abstract or distant concern with authority. Jesus said, "My Father is working still, and I am working." (John 5:17). I take this to affirm God's "personal" involvement with the world and his people in all ages and places. Under law God stands at a distance as judge, but in Christ he stands near as Father. It seems to me that much of Church of Christ thought and preaching are more concerned to "lay down the law" in the name of God than to offer acceptance, love, and sustaining fellowship in the name of God. I remember that while I was still in the Church of Christ one of the marks often claimed to make the soundness of a man's preaching suspect was that he talked more about love than he did fear and law-keeping. Yet the reality of personal well-being can exist only in a sense of being loved, both in a human and beyond human reality.

Personal reality also includes an "openness" to life in our times and life in the world as the creation of God. Preoccupation with 1st century Christianity and with the one true church seem to encourage a "shut-up-ness" or a "split-in-to-ness" of living. It can encourage making a radical contrast between being a Christian and being of the world, and retreating from hallowing fully the simple goods, affections, and satisfactions of life. It

may allow defining some things as religious and other things as secular, where God is thought to be pleased by certain "religious activities" but having no concern with how we make our living, vote, or try to out-do or out-shine others.

I believe that it was C. S. Lewis, who was at one time an unbeliever, who said that his new found Christian faith helped him be more tolerant and accepting of others. It gave him more openness to his fellow human kind. Our faith should give us more graciousness in affirming God's grace for others.

Church of Christ teaching has emphasized "Let's go back!" It would make more sense to me to stress, "Let's be awake and alive to the living God—now." If God is God he isn't back anywhere! The Christian faith should help us be more open to our own times and to the future.

The gospel witnesses to and makes possible our rebirth and participation in eternal life. Jesus Christ himself is the gospel, the intrinsic quality and reality of who he was, and what God has made possible through him. And when God through this man Jesus Christ gives us new birth in trust, love, and hope, we are given a great deal of freedom of thought and action. In Christ the hostile split between orthodoxy ("my-doxy") and heterodoxy ("your-doxy") are not God-given. "For He (Jesus Christ) is our peace, who has made us both one, and has broken down the dividing wall of hostility . . . and might reconcile us both to God in one body through the cross …" (Eph. 2:14-16). It would really be something if we could or would let God in Christ's Spirit do this for us.—*1311 W. 22nd St., Lawrence, Kan. 66044*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

Things That Matter Most … No. 4

IN DEFENSE OF AN ERRING BROTHER

They are after Bill Banowsky of the Broadway church in Lubbock. Some of the "war bulletins" of congregations across the country have written him up for accepting an invitation from the Baptists to speak at one of their Sunday School conventions. The *Gospel Guardian* also has an article entitled "Banowsky Backed Down" blazing across the front page, with brother Roy E. Cogdill serving as surgeon of the operation.

A word of defense may be in order. Not that it will likely do brother Banowsky any particular good to be defended in the pages of *Restoration Review,* especially within *Guardian* circles, but there are principles involved that we think are important, and an exploration of these might do a lot of good.

Brother Cogdill's attack upon the Lubbock minister is especially disturbing, for if our brotherhood is made to move in the direction that would please the *Guardian*, we are doomed to be nothing more than an arrogant sect that assumes an insipid infallibility. Some of us need to protest when a brother is castigated because he would dare to sit with Baptists in one of their conventions and say a word from the Bible. To Roy Cogdill this is "fraternizing with error," and he calls on Banowsky to give an account of himself.

It so happens that our Lubbock brother did not actually make the speech for the Baptists. He was advertised as a featured speaker, along with information about him and his church. Then he asked to be excused. Roy wants to know why Bill backed down. They've invited him to give an explanation as to why he did not go on and make his speech once he had agreed to, but he only says that he doesn't want to make a mountain out of a mole hill. So they are after him, trying like a Freudian psychologist to uncover the motive for his behavior. Roy seems to think that Bill acted out of political expediency, fearing that he might offend the Lord's people for hobnobbing with the Baptists.

Now isn't this some issue for the lead article of a religious journal. With the world falling apart around us we dilly-dally with this kind of thing. Even while our religious neighbors put forth noble efforts to achieve the unity for which our Lord prayed we busy ourselves by devouring each other at tiddlewinks. In a culture that is making historic strides toward better understanding among all religions, we chastise a brother who would venture so far from home as to appear on a Baptist program.

It is hard to believe that Roy Cogdill is not really a bigger person than this would suggest, and we would hope that the *Guardian* envisages for itself a nobler role in brotherhood history than to be trite. All the fratricide of recent years has caused brethren to be less than magnanimous. Not only have we become insensitive to the love that hides a multitude of sins, but we have become unreasonable and impassioned in our drive to impose our own opinions upon others, which we neatly equate with "the truth."

The most important fact about Roy Cogdill's piece on Bill Banowsky is that he is wrong. He is morally, logically, and scripturally wrong. He is morally wrong because he obstructs a brother's urge to be free and out-going in his spiritual experiences. It is like not letting a bird sing. Nothing is more natural than for man to exchange ideas with those with whom he differs, to speak and to listen, and to grow thereby. If it is wrong to impede a child's growth so that he is stunted, then it is wrong to force brethren into a kind of straitjacket of orthodoxy, lest they become intellectually responsible citizens of the kingdom of heaven.

Brother Cogdill is logically wrong because his conclusions simply do not follow. He speaks of association with Baptists as "having fellowship with error," and implies that "participating in inter -denominational meetings" makes one a *liberal.* He gives the precious term "the truth" such slanted usage that one would suppose it had relevance to *where*

one speaks and *with whom* one speaks and *to whom* one speaks rather than WHAT one speaks. Roy expresses no concern whatever as to what Bill might have said at the Baptist convention. The whole point is that they were Baptists. It is the old fallacy of guilt by association. If one mingles with the Baptists, then he is held responsible for everything that Baptists are supposed to believe. This would not follow even in the case of a Baptist, for one might belong to the Baptist Church without being "Baptistic" in his thinking. So our brother is grossly guilty of the fallacy of *non sequitur.* It simply does not follow that brother Banowsky is "fraternizing with error" because he speaks, or agrees to speak, at a Baptist convention.

According to Roy Cogdill's logic, Bill Banowsky is *already* "fraternizing with error" in that he ministers to the Broadway congregation, which is a "liberal" church. The only way for Bill to escape this peril would be to leave one party and join another, Brother Cogdill's. But this really would not solve his problem, just as it does not for Brother Cogdill, for whenever "error" shows itself one would again have to flee its presence, lest he have "fellowship with error." The brother who is out-of-error one day might be in-error the next, so one must be constantly on guard to make sure he is not hobnobbing with errorists. And what party among us will dare to claim it is free of all error?

The only answer to the question as to whether we might have fellowship with brethren who are in error is that there is no one else with whom to have fellowship. I certainly honor both Roy Cogdill and Bill Banowsky as my brothers, and I have no trouble loving them both and sharing with them the common life; but not because they are free of error, for they are not; but because they are children of God.

Since I've referred to Roy's sin against logic, we might further observe what logic does to his position. Let's try a syllogism:

All brethren whom we may fellowship are brethren who are without error.

No brethren are without error.

Therefore, there are no brethren whom we may fellowship.

Brother Cogdill affirms the major premise in his article about brother Banowsky. I affirm the minor premise. Unless he is willing to deny the minor premise, the conclusion necessarily follows since it obeys all the rules of logic.

Now let brother Cogdill name just one brother who is without error. He cannot and he dare not. Then there is no one with whom he can have fellowship, according to his position. He is forced to admit, therefore, that we can enjoy fellowship with each other, all of us having errors of some description, without having "fellowship with error."

This takes us to a consideration of the truth about error. Obviously errors differ in kind and intensity. Peter and Judas were both "brothers in error," but there was an important difference. Peter erred in cursing and denying that he even knew his Lord, but he did this

amidst an act of courage that was beyond that of the other disciples, who fled when Jesus was captured. Peters' heart was right. He was overtaken by the immensity of the situation. He immediately began to cry his heart out for what he had done. This kind of error would not call for a withdrawal of fellowship, would it?

There were other errors in Peter's thought and behavior, some serious enough to call forth Paul's wrath, and while this may have stained the fellowship, it certainly did not nullify it. If brother Cogdill will allow as much difference between brethren today as there was between Peter and Paul, without an impairment of fellowship, then he should be willing to whistle for the dogs that he has turned loose on brother Banowsky.

There is error like Peter's, but then there is error like Judas' — or like that fornicator at Corinth or the heretic in Titus 3:10, or like Hymenaeus and Alexander. Peter's heart was right; Judas' wasn't. The fornicator at Corinth was not merely overtaken in a trespass; he had committed his life to sin. The heretic in Titus 3:10 is described in the following verse as "perverted, sinful, and self-condemned," and as for Hymeanaeus and Alexander it says of them that they "rejected conscience."

Now if Bill Banowsky were fraternizing with folk like these, I would support Roy Cogdill's criticism, though we would do better to leave it in the hands of his elders, it not being our business. Discipline is not for publishers and editors.

But surely there is a difference between those who are described in the Bible as perverted, self-condemned, and without conscience, with whom fellowship would not be possible, and such people as might be gathered at a Baptist Sunday School convention. How unfair it is for brother Cogdill to say that "having fellowship with error" is only a "mole hill" to brother Banowsky. That is as bad as saying a man doesn't believe in helping orphans when he chooses not to support Boles Home. It may be that brother Banowsky disdains "fellowship with error" as much as brother Cogdill, but does not see that making a speech for the Baptists would involve this.

I have said that Roy was scripturally wrong as well as morally and logically, and it is here that his error is most grievous—though certainly of not the nature to cause a breach of fellowship between us, for I consider brother Cogdill a good and sincere man. But he misunderstands 2 John 9-11 when he applies it to something like Banowsky's agreement to visit the Baptists. To say that a Baptist is necessarily one who "has gone onward and does not abide in the doctrine of Christ" and therefore "has not God," as the passage reads, is not only to be judgmental but also to be unkind. And who is to say? Suppose a Baptist says the same thing about Roy Cogdill because he belongs to the Church of Christ?

Brother Cogdill must not allow himself to treat the Bible that way, and he should not want to treat the Baptists that way nor Bill Banowsky. He knows that John's epistles were composed in order to combat the Gnostic heresy, and that John was writing of factious men who were bent upon destroying the body of Christ for the sake of their divisive

doctrine, which was a denial of the incarnation of Christ. John was giving instructions about men who were involved in "wicked work" (verse 11). He calls them "deceivers" and says they deny that the Christ has come in the flesh (verse 7). Is brother Cogdill serious when he applies such Biblical descriptions to the Baptists?

Verse 10 says that we are not to allow such deceivers into our home. Does brother Cogdill mean that he turns Baptists from his door, not even allowing them the hospitality of his home? Does he practice the kind of religion that he would impose upon our Lubbock brother?

A critical look at this passage will lead us to some such conclusion as that reached by Prof. Barclay of Glasgow, that it was an emergency regulation designed to protect the still unconsolidated churches from the insidious influence of Gnosticism. History has it that the same writer fled from a bath-house because of the presence of a leading Gnostic heretic. Surely this passage isn't telling me that I have to flee public places if a Baptist shows up, or that I have to bar my door to them. But this is the kind of interpretation that brother Cogdill is giving it, at least for Bill Banowsky if not for himself.

Here I sit in my office the day after having both a premillennial Church of Christ brother and a Baptist in my home the night before, along with other "faithful brethren" like Roy Cogdill and myself. We ate together, prayed together, and talked about the Lord together. That is fellowship, isn't it, or more properly an *expression* of fellowship or the shared life. I agree neither with the Baptist nor the premill brother on a lot of things, just as I don't agree with "faithful brethren" on a lot of things, but it is hard for me to see that I disobeyed 2 John 9. It is equally hard for me to see that Bill Banowsky would have, had he accepted his now notorious invitation.

Brother Cogdill is not only morally, logically and scripturally wrong, but also in contradiction to what our most respected leaders have always practiced from the inception of the Restoration Movement. The Campbells spent their lives speaking for churches of all descriptions, and Alexander Campbell opened both his college and the Bethany congregation to representatives of all the denominations. James Harding, even when debating the Baptists, made a point to recognize them as brothers. One reads of "Brother Moody" all through the Moody-Harding Debate. Raccoon John Smith chose to stay with the Baptists, so as to bring them closer to Christ, and refused to leave even when they wanted him to.

It is a cruel and abrasive doctrine that says we cannot go among our religious neighbors and carry on dialogue with them, except it be perhaps to reprove their errors. Only if one of our ministers makes sure that he "skins 'em" is it lawful for him to venture forth. So he spends his time preaching to those who already agree with him on everything.

I believe we can do as brother Campbell did back when our Movement first began in this country. He spoke everywhere. And he did not feel obligated to berate his audience to the point that he would not be invited back — the sure criterion in some circles today.

Campbell would lecture long on the great themes of the Bible, such as ‘’The Philanthropy of God.” Certainly he addressed himself to lively and controversial issues, but always in the spirit of sharing truth with equals.

Why cannot Bill Banowsky and Roy Cogdill and all the rest of us do the same thing without 2 John 9 thrown at us, as if we were doing some evil deed? I would like to encourage brother Cogdill to break free of the sectarian shell that now confines him, so that he will indeed be a free man in Christ. He is a dedicated, intelligent man, and the world that Christ died for needs him. If the Christ he loves could move in such forbidden circles that his enemies would say of Him that “He associates with sinners,” then surely Roy Cogdill can at least touch base with folk no worse than Baptists.

If he wants me to say that Baptists are “in error,” I will readily do so. But perhaps no more readily than many responsible Baptist leaders who realize that they yet have much to learn. Why cannot we in the Churches of Christ show the same attitude. We too are “in error” about some things no doubt, so let’s talk together and share together, hand in hand, in an effort to be drawn closer to each other by being drawn closer to Christ.

We have miles to travel before we rest, brother Cogdill. Let’s not leave the impression that we have arrived, waiting somewhat impatiently for the rest of the world.

You can subscribe to this journal for one year for only a dollar; in clubs of 6 or more at 50 cents each. Back copies available at 15 cents each.

RESTORATION REVIEW, *1201 Windsor Drive, Denton, Texas 76201.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

RESTORATION REVIEW is published monthly (except July and August) at 1201 Windsor Dr., Denton, Texas. Leroy Garrett, Editor. Second class permit at Denton, Texas. Subscription rate is $1.00 per annum; 50 cents in clubs of 6 or more.

Address all mail to: 1201 Windsor Drive, Denton, Texas 76201.*